DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 208 737 HE 014 424

AUTHOR Johnson, Deborah H.; Sedlacek, William E.
TITLE A Comparison of White Male and Female Students' Racial Attitudes.
INSTITUTION Maryland Univ., College Park. Counseling Center.
REPORT NO UM-CC-RR-20-79
PUB DATE 79
NOTE 21p.; For related documents see HE 014 420-421.
AVAILABLE FROM University of Maryland, Office of Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, Counseling Center, College Park, MD 20742 ($1.50).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Attitude Measures; *Blacks; *College Freshmen; Females; Higher Education; Institutional Research; Males; *Racial Attitudes; School Surveys; *Sex Differences; *Student Attitudes; *Whites
IDENTIFIERS Situational Attitude Scale (Sedlacek and Brooks); University of Maryland College Park

ABSTRACT

Two hundred sixty-six white freshmen (128 males, 138 females) were administered the Situational Attitude Scale (SAS) to assess their attitudes toward blacks in a number of personal and social situations. Results of two-way analyses of variance indicated that significant differences occurred by sex and form of the SAS. Differences between the two forms, one that depicted blacks, and the other, which did not mention race, were taken as evidence for a differential reaction to blacks. Regardless of form, women reacted more negatively than men to situations regarding rape, a magazine salesman, and men loitering on a corner; men felt more negative about new neighbors, a friend's engagement, and a new member of a social group. On form, regardless of sex, whites reacted most negatively to blacks as new neighbors, and a friend being engaged to a black. Whites tended to react positively to blacks in service roles (selling magazines, policeman). The interaction of sex and form was not significant. These results, along with previous samples of freshmen, suggest that whites have had and continue to hold basically negative attitudes toward blacks, and the pattern of those negative attitudes has remained the same for a decade. (Author/LB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED208737

COUNSELING CENTER

Office of Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

College Park, Maryland

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Counseling Center
Univ of MD
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

ED144424

A COMPARISON OF WHITE MALE AND FEMALE STUDENTS' RACIAL ATTITUDES

Deborah E. Johnson and William E. Sedlacek

Research Report # 10-79

COUNSELING CENTER
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
COLLEGE PARK, MARYLAND

A COMPARISON OF WHITE MALE AND FEMALE STUDENTS' RACIAL ATTITUDES

Deborah H. Johnson and William E. Sedlacek

Research Report # 20-79

Summary

Two hundred sixty-six white freshmen (128 males, 138 females) were administered the Situational Attitude Scale (SAS) which assessed their attitudes toward blacks in a number of personal and social situations. Results of 2-way analyses of variance indicated that significant differences occurred by sex and form of the SAS. Differences between the two forms, one which depicted blacks, and the other which did not mention race, were taken as evidence for a differential reaction to blacks.

Regardless of form, women reacted more negatively than men to situations regarding rape, a magazine salesman, and men loitering on a corner, while men felt more negative about new neighbors, a friend's engagement, and a new member of a social group. On form, regardless of sex, whites reacted most negatively to blacks as new neighbors, and a friend being engaged to a black. Whites tended to react positively to blacks in service roles (selling magazines, policeman). The interaction of sex and form was not significant.

A discussion of these results compared to previous samples of freshmen concluded that whites have had, and continue to hold, basically negative attitudes toward blacks, and the pattern of those negative attitudes has remained the same for a decade.

Differential attitudes of white persons toward blacks and toward whites have been found consistently by various investigators (Sheatsley, 1966). The concept of racial attitudes often has been considered a unitary concept, indicating general attitudes toward blacks; however, racial attitudes have many components. The multi-faceted nature of white racial attitudes was highlighted in a study by Caditz (1975), who found that even persons who hold generally liberal attitudes may have negative reactions in some situations. According to that study, the personal immediacy or closeness of a given situation affects the extent of negative racial attitudes. Thus, on a scale such as the Situational Attitude Scale (SAS) (Sedlacek and Brooks, 1970, 1972a), which uses white subjects' reactions to hypothetical interpersonal situations as a measure of racial attitudes, it would be expected that the more personal situations would elicit more negative racial attitudes from white subjects.

Just as racial attitudes may be somewhat dependent upon the situation, racial attitudes in various situations may differ across various groups of people. Brigham and Severy (1973) found that their white subjects could be divided into four groups according to their racial attitudes: 1) those who had negative attitudes in general, 2) those who were most negative in economic or social situations, 3) those who were most concerned with personal interracial contact, and 4) those who had most negative racial attitudes in situations when the hierarchical status relationships between races were salient. Thus, various situations elicited different reactions in different people. Similarly, subgroups of the population might be expected to show negative racial attitudes in different ways. Since consistent sex differences in personality have been shown, particularly regarding social orientation (e.g., American Council on Education, 1971), males and females might have different racial attitudes according to the social nature of the interracial situation.

Sedlacek and Brooks (1972b) also suggested that a physical harm dimension might underlie male-female differences in attitudes toward interpersonal situations, and that this dimension might interact with racial attitudes.

The purpose of the present study was to further examine white subjects' attitudes toward interpersonal situations as a function of the race of the persons in the situation and the sex of the subject. The social nature of the situation and the extent to which the possibility of physical harm is perceived were hypothesized as two dimensions along which differences might be found.

METHOD

Subjects

Subjects for this study were 266 white, incoming freshmen at the University of Maryland, College Park, who attended the Summer Orientation Program.

Instrument

The Situational Attitude Scale (SAS) (Sedlacek and Brooks, 1970) was used in the present study. In the SAS, ten interpersonal situations (see Table 1) are presented to the subject, who is asked to rate his/her responses to each situation on ten Semantic Differential scales. There are two forms of the SAS: Form A, which does not mention race in the descriptions of the interpersonal situations, and Form B, which is identical to Form A, but which describes the persons in the situations as being black. Thus, responses on Form B can be compared to those on Form A to determine whether persons respond differently to interpersonal situations with Blacks from the way they respond to interpersonal situations with persons of unspecified race.

Procedure

Two forms of the SAS, forms A and B, were administered to students attending the 2-day Summer Orientation Program. Forms A and B were randomly distributed to the students, and each student had an approximately equal chance of receiving either form. The following n's were used in the present analysis: Form A male: 67; Form A female: 76; Form B male: 61; Form B female: 62.

RESULTS

Means and standard deviations were computed for each item by subgroup (sex by SAS form); and two-way analyses of variance were done for each item, using sex and form as main effects. Table 2 presents these means, standard deviations, and significant F-tests. Sex was found to have a significant effect in 48 out of the 100 items; SAS form in 47 out of 100; and interaction of sex by form, in 10 of 100. Sakoda, Cohen, and Beall (1954) noted that when multiple significance tests are done, some tests will be significant by chance alone; at the .05 level, nine out of 100 independent tests would be expected to be significant by chance alone.

Several situations differentiated males' attitudes from females' attitudes, regardless of form. Women felt more negative than men about situations in which a woman was raped (situation II), a man was selling magazines (situation III), and men loitered on a street corner (situation IV). Men were more negative than women about situations in which a new family moves next door (situation I), a friend becomes engaged (situation V), and a new person joins their social group (situation VII). Some sex differences were also seen in the situations in which the subject is stopped by a policeman (situation VI), a youngster steals (situation VIII), and the subject is the only person standing on a crowded bus (situation X), but these differences were mixed in terms of direction of the differences (e.g., on some males were more positive, on others females were more positive).

In comparing differences on form, students felt more negative toward blacks than toward persons of unspecified race in situations in which a new (black) family moves next door (situation V). However, students reacted more favorably to blacks than to persons of unspecified race in the situations in which a (black) man is selling magazines (situation III) and the subject is stopped by a (black) policeman (situation VI). While reactions were mixed in terms of

favorableness, there were differences due to SAS form in attitudes toward the situations in which a (black) person joins the subject's social group (situation VII) and (black) students stage a demonstration (situation IX).

Ten of the 100 items showed a significant interaction effect of sex and form. Three of these interactions occurred in the situation in which a woman was raped by a (black) man (situation II). Males tended to feel more negative toward blacks than toward persons of unspecified race in this situation, while females felt less negative toward blacks than toward others.

A comparison was made of the data from the present study with the data from a similar, previous study (Sedlacek and Brooks, 1972b). The overall pattern of findings in the present study was quite similar to that in the 1972 study. Both found that females hold more positive attitudes on situation I, V, and VII, and more negative attitudes on situations II, III, and IV. Generally negative attitudes towards blacks were seen in both studies on situations I and V, while blacks elicited positive attidudes on situations III and VI. The largest number of interactions of sex and form occurs in situation II (man raped woman) in both studies.

DISCUSSION

In general, the results of the present study confirm those of the previous, similar study by Sedlacek and Brooks (1972b). White students reacted more negatively overall to hypothetical interpersonal situations in which blacks were involved than to those in which the race of the involved persons was not specified. Attitudes towards blacks seemed to depend upon the relationship of the blacks to the white subjects: in closer, more personal situations (e.g., a friend's engagement), attitudes towards blacks were more negative than towards persons of unspecified race, while in more distant, service-type relationships (e.g., being stopped by a policeman), attitudes were more positive toward blacks than toward persons of unspecified race.

Males and females responded somewhat differently to various interpersonal situations. As Sedlacek and Brooks (1972b) noted, perceived threat of physical harm in a situation seems to differentiate males from females. Women seemed to feel more vulnerable in situations in which a strange man is nearby, and they responded more negatively to such situations than did men. However, an additional theory may help to further explain the differences between men's and women's attitudes toward interpersonal situations: women are generally socialized to feel more favorable about close social relationships and to be more understanding of other people. Women in the present study felt more positive than did men about situations in which neighbors, social groups, and children were involved. Thus, female differences in attitudes may have two underlying components in serial situations: feelings of vulnerability, and person-orientation. Further studies of differences between men and women in interpersonal situations could use factor analysis to test whether these two factors do exist independently.

While the results regarding interactive effects of test form and sex are somewhat more mixed, the general trend appears to be toward males having slightly more negative attitudes toward blacks and females having somewhat more positive attitudes toward blacks. This pattern is particularly evident in situation II (man raped woman), the situation in which three of the ten significant interactions occurred. Here, women felt more negative than men in general, but tended to feel slightly less negative when the rapist was black than when his race was not specified. For men, attitudes were reversed: a black rapist elicited more negative feelings than did a rapist of unspecified race. The theories of vulnerability and person-orientation may account for this difference. Women certainly feel more personally threatened by a rape of a woman than do men, but may feel a social pressure to understand rape by a black man as an act of frustration by a minority person and thus feel less

negative toward the black rapist than toward a man of unspecified race. The (white) male subjects, on the other hand, may identify more with the man of unspecified race and feel more anger toward a black male raping a white woman. Thus, personal identification with the persons in the situations may affect students' attitudes.

The similarity of the results of the present study to those of the 1972 study by Sedlacek and Brooks lends support to these conclusions. It is particularly noteworthy that the patterns of racial attitudes have not changed significantly since 1972, and that females continued to appear to be differentiated from males in terms of feelings of vulnerability and person-orientation, as manifested in situational attitudes. In order to examine whether these clusters of attitude items indeed are statistically significant, further studies of differences in racial attitudes of males and females could use factor analysis.

REFERENCES

American Council on Education. The American freshman: National norms for fall 1971. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1971.

Brigham, J.C., & Severy, L.J. An empiraically derived grouping of whites on the basis of expressed attitudes toward blacks. Representative Research in Social Psychology, 1973, 4(2), 48-55.

Caditz, J. Ambivalence toward integration: The sequence of response to six interracial situations. The Sociological Quarterly, 1975, 16(1), 16-32.

Sakoda, J.M., Cohen, B.H., & Beall, G. Tests of Significance for a series statistical tests. Psychological Bulletin, 1954, 51, 172-175.

Sedlacek, W.E., & Brooks, G.C. Measuring racial attitudes in a situational context. Psychological Reports, 1970, 27, 971-980.

Sedlacek, W.E., & Brooks, G.C. Situational Attitude Scale (SAS) Manual. Chicago: Natresources, Inc., 1972a.

Sedlacek, W.E., & Brooks, G.C. Differences in racial attitudes of white males and females. University of Maryland Cultural Study Center Research Report #2-72, 1972b.

Sheatsley, P.B. White attitudes toward the Negro. Daedalus, 1966, 95, 217-237.

TABLE I

INSTRUCTIONS AND SITUATIONS FROM THE SITUATIONAL ATTITUDE SCALE*

INSTRUCTIONS

This questionnaire measures how people think and feel about a number of social and personal incidents and situations. It is not a test so there are no right or wrong answers. The questionnaire is anonymous, so please DO NOT SIGN YOUR NAME.

Each item or situation is followed by 10 descriptive word scales. Your task is to select, for each descriptive scale, the rating which best describes YOUR feelings toward the item.

Sample item: Going out on a date.

happy ' A ' B ' C ' D ' E ' sad

You would indicate the direction and extent of your feelings (e.g., you might select B) by indicating your choice (B) on your response sheet by blackening in the appropriate space for that word scale. DO NOT MARK ON THE BOOKLET. PLEASE RESPOND TO ALL WORD SCALES.

Sometimes you will feel as though you had the same item before on the questionnaire. This will not be the case, so DO NOT LOOK BACK AND FORTH through the items. Do not try to remember how you checked similar items earlier in the questionnaire. MAKE EACH ITEM A SEPERATE AND INDEPENDENT JUDGMENT. Respond as honestly as possible without puzzling over individual items. Respond with your first impressions whenever possible.

SITUATIONS

	FORM A	FORM B
I.	A new family moves in next door to you.	A new black family moves in next door to you.
II.	You read in the paper that a man has raped a woman.	You read in the paper that a black man has raped a woman.
III.	It is evening and a man appears at your door saying he is selling magazines.	It is evening and a black man appears at your door saying he is selling magazines.
IV.	You are walking down the street alone and must pass a corner where a group of five young men are loitering.	You are walking down the street alone and must pass a corner where a group of five young black men are loitering.
V.	Your best friend has just become engaged.	Your best friend has just become engaged to a black person.
VI.	You are stopped for speeding by a policeman.	You are stopped for speeding by a black policeman.
VII.	A new person joins your social group.	A new black person joins your social group.
VIII.	You see a youngster steal something in a dimestore.	You see a black youngster steal something in a dimestore.
IX.	Some students on campus stage a demonstration.	Some black students on campus stage a demonstration.
X.	You get on the bus and you are the only person who has to stand.	You get on a bus that has all black people aboard and you are the only person who has to stand.

*The Situational Attitude Scale (SAS) is copyrighted. It is available from Doctor William E. Sedlacek, Counseling Center, University of Maryland, College Park 20742.

TABLE 2

Means *, Standard Deviations, and Results of Analyses of Variance

Item No.	SITUATIONS** BIPOLAR ADJECTIVE DIMENSION	Male				Female				Differences Significant At .01***
		Form A(N=67)		Form B(N=61)		Form B(N=76)		Form B(N=62)		
		Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	
	I. NEW FAMILY NEXT DOOR									
1.	good - bad	1.09	0.87	1.92	0.99	0.84	0.91	1.68	0.83	F,S
2.	safe - unsafe	1.22	0.87	1.44	1.07	1.14	0.86	1.39	1.11	F
3.	angry - not angry	3.41	0.96	2.97	1.12	3.72	0.78	2.92	1.22	F
4.	friendly - unfriendly	0.76	0.72	1.08	1.13	0.47	0.66	0.71	0.89	F,S
5.	sympathetic - not sympathetic	1.60	1.10	2.57	1.18	1.68	1.32	2.08	1.26	F,F x S
6.	nervous - calm	2.63	1.20	2.52	1.13	2.68	1.09	2.55	1.26	
7.	happy - sad	1.27	0.77	1.97	0.91	0.82	0.80	1.74	0.77	F,S
8.	objectionable - acceptable	3.05	0.96	2.69	1.16	3.00	1.17	3.00	1.09	
9.	desirable - undesirable	1.42	0.84	2.10	1.05	1.22	0.86	1.77	1.03	F,S
10.	suspicious - trusting	2.42	0.89	2.07	1.15	2.84	0.88	2.50	1.07	F,S
	II. MAN RAPED WOMAN									
11.	affection - disgust	3.45	0.86	3.72	0.55	3.87	0.44	3.92	0.28	F,S
12.	relish - repulsion	3.33	0.77	3.55	0.68	3.67	0.70	3.61	0.66	S
13.	happy - sad	3.40	0.76	3.72	0.58	3.80	0.49	3.94	0.31	F,S
14.	friendly - hostile	3.12	0.88	3.33	0.81	3.63	0.61	3.48	0.74	S,F x S
15.	uninvolved - involved	1.64	1.22	1.80	1.28	1.87	1.28	1.77	1.26	
16.	hope - hopelessness	2.02	1.14	2.48	1.16	2.43	1.09	2.47	1.11	
17.	aloof - outraged	2.57	1.03	3.08	0.84	3.19	0.78	2.95	0.94	S,F x S
18.	injure - kill	1.58	1.03	1.80	1.25	1.76	1.31	1.50	1.18	
19.	safe - fearful	1.83	1.14	2.61	1.04	3.14	0.86	2.84	1.07	S,F x S
20.	empathetic - can't understand	2.45	1.21	2.66	1.18	2.83	1.35	3.07	1.06	S

*Scale A to E (numerical equivalent 0 to 4).

**See Table 1 for complete situations.

***Results of 2-way analysis of variance (fixed effects) with F (form A or B) and S (Sex, Male or Female) as main effects and F x S as the interaction. Complete ANOVA Tables are available from Dr. William Sedlacek, Counseling Center, UMCP.

TABLE 2 (Continued)

Means *, Standard Deviations, and Results of Analyses of Variance

Item No.	SITUATIONS** BIPOLAR ADJECTIVE DIMENSION	Male Form A(N=67) Mean	Male Form A(N=67) S.D.	Male Form B(N=61) Mean	Male Form B(N=61) S.D.	Female Form B(N=76) Mean	Female Form B(N=76) S.D.	Female Form B(N=62) Mean	Female Form B(N=62) S.D.	Differences Significant At .01***
	III. MAN SELLING MAGAZINES									
21.	relaxed - startled	2.10	1.35	1.79	1.31	2.88	0.94	2.71	1.06	S
22.	receptive - cautious	2.79	1.14	2.48	1.21	3.38	0.91	3.36	0.87	S
23.	excited - unexcited	2.63	1.23	3.05	0.90	3.22	0.97	2.84	1.10	F x S
24.	glad - angered	2.42	0.82	2.12	0.64	2.40	0.75	2.29	0.49	F
25.	pleased - annoyed	2.84	0.88	2.54	0.85	2.74	0.92	2.79	0.80	
26.	indifferent - suspicious	2.28	1.44	1.97	1.46	3.01	1.11	2.45	1.33	F,S
27.	tolerable - intolerable	2.06	1.21	1.49	1.06	1.93	1.17	1.86	1.17	F
28.	afraid - secure	2.05	1.05	2.34	1.00	1.34	0.99	1.30	0.96	S
29.	friend - enemy	2.21	0.80	1.77	0.84	2.12	0.69	2.14	0.77	F,F x S
30.	unprotected - protected	2.38	1.05	2.28	1.06	1.63	1.02	1.50	1.16	S
	IV. CORNER OF LOITERING MEN									
31.	relaxed - tense	2.82	1.09	3.13	1.02	3.51	0.72	3.56	0.67	S
32.	pleased - angered	2.48	0.82	2.51	0.89	2.60	0.77	2.48	0.70	
33.	superior - inferior	2.06	1.12	1.97	1.14	2.47	1.09	2.39	0.88	S
34.	smarter - dumber	1.24	0.99	1.46	0.98	1.51	0.81	1.48	0.78	
35.	whiter - blacker	1.50	0.95	1.17	1.09	1.64	0.89	0.94	0.92	F
36.	aggressive - passive	2.22	1.14	2.38	1.29	2.56	1.09	2.71	1.08	S
37.	safe - unsafe	2.66	0.96	2.80	1.12	3.09	0.91	3.24	0.92	S
38.	friendly - unfriendly	2.36	1.19	1.97	1.22	2.53	1.07	2.50	0.92	S
39.	excited - unexcited	2.10	1.16	2.08	1.26	2.47	1.11	2.26	1.17	S
40.	trivial - important	1.94	1.04	1.88	1.14	1.76	1.04	1.97	1.06	

*Scale A to E (numerical equivalent 0 to 4).

**See Table 1 for complete situations.

***Results of 2-way analysis of variance (fixed effects) with F (form A or B) and S (Sex, Male or Female) as main effects and F x S as the interaction. Complete ANOVA Tables are available from Dr. William Sedlacek, Counseling Center, UMCP.

10.

TABLE 2 (Continued)

Means *, Standard Deviations, and Results of Analyses of Variance

Item No.	SITUATIONS** BIPOLAR ADJECTIVE DIMENSION	Male Form A(N=67) Mean	Male Form A(N=67) S.D.	Male Form B(N=61) Mean	Male Form B(N=61) S.D.	Female Form B(N=76) Mean	Female Form B(N=76) S.D.	Female Form B(N=62) Mean	Female Form B(N=62) S.D.	Differences Significant At .01***
	V. FRIEND BECOMES ENGAGED									
41.	aggressive - passive	2.09	1.37	2.41	1.42	1.65	1.25	2.23	1.14	F,S
42.	happy - sad	0.49	0.82	1.77	1.46	0.37	0.81	1.79	1.28	F
43.	tolerable - intolerable	0.55	0.93	1.28	1.34	0.38	0.76	1.05	1.29	F
44.	complimented - insulted	1.19	0.92	1.98	1.13	1.12	0.89	1.82	0.93	F
45.	angered - overjoyed	3.04	0.90	2.05	1.20	3.49	0.70	2.08	1.04	F,S
46.	secure - fearful	1.40	1.06	1.21	1.14	1.46	1.15	1.68	1.10	
47.	hopeful - hopeless	0.84	0.98	1.46	1.35	0.76	0.96	1.42	1.21	F
48.	excited - unexcited	0.85	0.94	1.75	1.30	0.30	0.69	1.52	1.25	F,S
49.	right - wrong	1.20	0.93	1.82	1.35	1.04	0.92	1.79	1.32	F
50.	disgusting - pleasing	3.08	0.93	2.12	1.36	3.59	0.70	2.13	1.19	F,S,F x S
	VI. STOPPED BY POLICEMAN									
51.	calm - nervous	3.02	1.31	2.46	1.57	3.40	1.08	2.64	1.55	F
52.	trusting - suspicious	2.32	1.28	1.18	1.26	1.95	1.33	1.06	1.07	F
53.	afraid - safe	1.59	1.31	2.64	1.42	1.42	1.33	2.42	1.49	F
54.	friendly - unfriendly	1.65	1.47	0.93	1.24	1.50	1.27	0.97	0.90	F
55.	tolerant - intolerant	1.72	1.41	0.95	1.19	1.16	1.14	0.74	1.01	F,S
56.	bitter - pleasant	1.65	1.32	2.36	1.42	2.00	1.23	2.26	1.23	F
57.	cooperative - uncooperative	0.87	1.13	0.56	1.13	0.47	0.81	0.26	0.54	F,S
58.	acceptable - billigerent	1.26	1.30	0.98	1.17	0.93	0.91	0.82	0.93	
59.	inferior - superior	1.77	1.04	1.80	0.94	1.15	0.91	1.73	0.55	F,S,F x S
60.	smarter - dumber	1.82	1.07	1.92	0.86	2.38	0.88	2.08	0.52	S

*Scale A to E (numerical equivalent 0 to 4).

**See Table 1 for complete situations.

***Results of 2-way analysis of variance (fixed effects) with F (form A or B) and S (Sex, Male or Female) as main effects and F x S as the interaction. Complete ANOVA Tables are available from Dr. William Sedlacek, Counseling Center, UMCP.

TABLE 2 (Continued)

Means *, Standard Deviations, and Results of Analyses of Variance

Item No.	SITUATIONS** BIPOLAR ADJECTIVE DIMENSION	Male Form A(N=67) Mean	Male Form A(N=67) S.D.	Male Form B(N=61) Mean	Male Form B(N=61) S.D.	Female Form B(N=76) Mean	Female Form B(N=76) S.D.	Female Form B(N=62) Mean	Female Form B(N=62) S.D.	Differences Significant At .01***
	VII. PERSON JOINS SOCIAL GROUP									
61.	warm - cold	1.12	0.99	1.08	0.97	0.80	0.82	0.63	0.85	S
62.	sad - happy	2.86	0.88	2.64	0.93	3.03	0.89	2.95	0.91	S
63.	superior - inferior	1.30	0.82	1.79	0.76	1.34	0.84	1.82	0.53	F
64.	threatened - neutral	2.88	1.20	3.15	1.17	3.08	1.18	3.50	0.84	F,S
65.	pleased - displeased	1.14	0.89	1.56	1.06	0.80	0.77	1.23	0.86	F,S
66.	understanding - indifferent	1.13	1.14	1.61	1.39	0.79	0.94	1.13	1.27	F,S
67.	suspicious - trusting	2.33	0.88	2.59	1.09	2.81	1.09	3.02	0.93	S
68.	disappointed - elated	2.46	0.66	2.12	0.97	2.47	0.84	2.36	0.68	F
69.	favorable - unfavorable	1.21	0.98	1.61	1.05	0.92	0.92	1.10	1.02	F,S
70.	uncomfortable - comfortable	2.64	0.99	2.56	1.26	2.76	1.26	2.93	1.03	
	VIII. YOUNGSTER STEALS									
71.	surprising - not surprising	2.36	1.51	2.71	1.31	2.24	1.55	2.18	1.44	
72.	sad - happy	1.08	0.99	0.88	0.90	0.68	0.80	0.44	0.74	F,S
73.	disinterested - interested	2.45	1.31	2.34	1.38	2.55	1.12	2.52	1.10	
74.	close - distant	2.18	1.27	2.41	1.13	2.22	1.24	2.52	1.10	
75.	understandable - baffling	1.88	1.19	2.00	1.40	2.33	1.20	1.98	1.24	
76.	responsible - not responsible	2.63	1.28	2.61	1.23	2.78	1.25	2.45	1.38	
77.	concerned - unconcerned	1.42	1.22	1.44	1.35	1.09	1.08	1.19	1.14	S
78.	sympathy - indifference	2.24	1.28	2.36	1.39	1.79	1.25	1.71	1.37	S
79.	expected - unexpected	1.84	1.23	1.62	1.19	2.30	1.08	2.05	1.26	S
80.	hopeful - hopeless	2.24	1.05	2.28	1.15	1.99	1.09	1.84	1.16	S

*Scale A to E (numerical equivalent 0 to 4).

**See Table 1 for complete situations.

***Results of 2-way analysis of variance (fixed effects) with F (form A or B) and S (Sex, Male or Female) as main effects and F x S as the interaction. Complete ANOVA Tables are available from Dr. William Sedlacek, Counseling Center, UMCP.

TABLE 2 (Continued)

Means *, Standard Deviations, and Results of Analyses of Variance

Item No.	SITUATIONS** BIPOLAR ADJECTIVE DIMENSION	Male Form A(N=67) Mean	Male Form A(N=67) S.D.	Male Form B(N=61) Mean	Male Form B(N=61) S.D.	Female Form B(N=76) Mean	Female Form B(N=76) S.D.	Female Form B(N=62) Mean	Female Form B(N=62) S.D.	Difference Significa At .01*
	IX. CAMPUS DEMONSTRATION									
81.	bad - good	2.15	1.06	1.72	1.20	2.10	0.87	1.73	1.03	F
82.	understanding - indifferent	1.54	1.10	2.02	1.12	1.66	1.13	1.87	1.14	F
83.	suspicious - trusting	1.82	0.90	1.62	1.05	2.00	0.86	1.92	0.93	S
84.	safe - unsafe	1.87	1.01	2.33	1.21	2.16	0.97	2.39	1.15	F
85.	disturbed - undisturbed	2.09	1.15	1.74	1.28	1.90	1.04	1.52	1.11	F
86.	justified - unjustified	1.48	0.89	1.85	1.11	1.59	0.77	1.53	0.86	F x S
87.	tense - calm	1.85	1.07	1.97	1.17	1.79	0.96	1.60	1.08	
88.	hate - love	2.02	0.60	2.05	0.80	2.12	0.54	2.05	0.50	
89.	wrong - right	2.24	0.79	2.08	0.94	2.13	0.64	2.05	0.93	
90.	humorous - serious	2.70	0.99	2.92	1.00	2.71	0.87	2.97	0.99	F
	X. ONLY PERSON STANDING									
91.	fearful - secure	2.20	1.11	1.62	1.37	2.05	1.21	1.31	1.10	F
92.	tolerable - intolerable	1.54	1.20	1.65	1.35	1.20	1.11	1.27	1.09	S
93.	hostile - indifferent	2.57	1.12	2.33	1.35	2.83	1.20	2.57	0.97	
94.	important - trivial	2.56	1.04	2.72	1.21	2.99	1.06	2.40	1.15	F x S
95.	conspicious - inconspicious	1.57	1.34	1.25	1.19	1.21	1.34	1.15	1.34	
96.	calm - anxious	1.75	1.33	2.08	1.45	1.88	1.43	2.57	1.13	F
97.	indignant - understanding	2.54	1.08	1.95	1.15	2.62	1.25	2.43	0.96	F,S
98.	comfortable - uncomfortable	2.36	1.21	2.53	1.43	2.76	1.12	3.02	1.09	S
99.	hate - love	1.94	0.50	1.89	0.86	1.99	0.51	2.07	0.58	
100.	not resentful - resentful	1.73	1.14	1.85	1.36	1.24	1.23	1.40	1.03	S

*Scale A to E (numerical equivalent 0 to 4).

**See Table 1 for complete situations.

***Results of 2-way analysis of variance (fixed effects) with F (form A or B) and S (Sex, Male or Female) as main effects and F x S as the interaction. Complete ANOVA Tables are available from Dr. William Sedlacek, Counseling Center, UMCP.